



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

(M)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,439	11/16/2001	Avi J. Ashkenazi	P2730PIC52	3941
35489	7590	04/19/2004	EXAMINER	
HELLER EHRLMAN WHITE & MCAULIFFE LLP 275 MIDDLEFIELD ROAD MENLO PARK, CA 94025-3506				MURPHY, JOSEPH F
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1646		

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/990,439	ASHKENAZI ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Joseph F Murphy	1646	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 November 2001.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 119-138 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 124-131 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 119-123 and 132-138 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                      |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .   |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/24/2002</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  |
|  | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Sequence Comparison A</u> . |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Formal Matters***

Claims 1-118 were cancelled and new claims 119-138 were added in the Preliminary Amendment submitted 11/16/2001. Claims 119-138 are pending and under consideration.

### ***Priority***

According to the priority statement of 11/16/2001, it appears that priority is being claimed to a large number of utility and provisional applications. These applications appear to be drawn to unrelated subject matter and are either not available for consideration or for which consideration to determine support for the instantly claimed subject matter would require an undue burden. Accordingly, the subject matter defined in claims 119-138 has an effective filing date of 11/16/2001, that of the instant application.

Applicants are requested to provide the serial number and specific page number(s) of any parent application to which priority is desired which specifically supports the particular claim limitation for each and every claim limitation in all the pending claims which applicant considers to have been in possession and fully enabled of prior to 11/16/2001.

### ***Specification***

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. Applicant should restrict the title to the claimed invention.

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

References A1 and A2 on the IDS submitted 5/24/ 2002 have been lined through because they are not in the correct format. The citation should include the author and publication date, pursuant to 37 CFR 1.98.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 first paragraph***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 119-123, 132-138 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, which is enabling for a nucleic acid encoding a full length PRO830 protein of SEQ ID NO: 175, or a nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO: 174, does not reasonably provide enablement for a nucleic acid at least 80-99% identical to SEQ ID NO: 174, or a nucleic acid at least 80-99% identical to a nucleic acid encoding SEQ ID NO: 174. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Claims 119-123, 132-138 are overly broad since insufficient guidance is provided as to which of the myriad of nucleic acids encode variant polypeptides which will retain the characteristics of PRO830. However, Applicants do not disclose any actual or prophetic examples on expected performance parameters of any of the possible muteins of PRO830. It is known in the art that even single amino acid changes or differences in the amino acid sequence of a protein can have dramatic effects on the protein's function. For example, As an example of the unpredictable effects of mutations on protein function, Mickle et al. teaches that cystic

fibrosis is an autosomal recessive disorder caused by abnormal function of a chloride channel, referred to as the cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator (CFTR) (page 597). Several mutations can cause CF, including the G551D mutation. In this mutation a glycine replaces the aspartic acid at position 551, giving rise to the CF phenotype. In the most common CF mutation, delta-F508, a single phenylalanine is deleted at position 508, giving rise to the CF phenotype. Thus showing that even the substitution or deletion of a single amino acid in the entire 1480 amino acid CFTR protein sequence can have dramatic and unpredictable effects on the function of the protein. Additionally, it is known in the art that even a single amino acid change in a protein's sequence can drastically affect the structure of the protein and the architecture of an entire cell. For example, Voet et al. (1990) teaches that a single Glu to Val substitution in the beta subunit of hemoglobin causes the hemoglobin molecules to associate with one another in such a manner that, in homozygous individuals, erythrocytes are altered from their normal discoid shape and assume the sickle shape characteristic of sickle-cell anemia, causing hemolytic anemia and blood flow blockages (pages 126-128, section 6-3A and page 230, column 2, first paragraph). Additionally, Yan et al. teaches that in certain cases, a change of two-amino acid residues in a protein results in switching the binding of the protein from one receptor to another (Yan et al., Two-amino acid molecular switch in an epithelial morphogen that regulates binding to two distinct receptors. *Science* 290: 523-527, 2000). Since the claims encompass nucleic acids encoding variant polypeptides and given the art recognized unpredictability of the effect of mutations on protein function, it would require undue experimentation to make and use the claimed invention. See *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404. The test of enablement is not whether any experimentation is necessary, but whether, if experimentation is

necessary, it is undue. While the Specification discloses that the polynucleotides may be used to detect cancer cells due to increased copy number (see Specification, Table 9A), the claims do not set forth a functional limitation for the nucleic acids encoding the variant polypeptides and since the amino acid sequence of a polypeptide determines its structural and functional properties, and the predictability of which amino acids can be substituted is extremely complex and outside the realm of routine experimentation, because accurate predictions of a polypeptide's structure from mere sequence data are limited. Since detailed information regarding the structural and functional requirements of the polynucleotide and the encoded polypeptide are lacking, it is unpredictable as to which variations, if any, meet the limitations of the claims. Applicant is required to enable one of skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention, while the claims encompass polynucleotides and encoded polypeptides which the specification only teaches one skilled in the art to test for functional variants. It would require undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to make and use the claimed polypeptides. Since the claims do not enable one of skill in the art to make and use the claimed polypeptides, but only teaches how to screen for the claimed polypeptides, and since detailed information regarding the structural and functional requirements of the polypeptides are lacking, it is unpredictable as to which variations, if any, meet the limitations of the claims. Thus, since Applicant has only taught how to test for nucleic acids encoding polypeptide variants of PRO830, and has not taught how to make nucleic acids encoding polypeptide variants of PRO830, it would require undue experimentation of one of skill in the art to make and use the claimed polynucleotides.

Claims 119-123, 132-138 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001.

The claims are drawn to nucleic acids at least 80-99% identical to SEQ ID NO: 174, or nucleic acids at least 80-99% identical to a nucleic acid encoding SEQ ID NO: 175 and are thus genus claims. The specification and claim do not indicate what distinguishing attributes shared by the members of the genus. The specification and claims do not place any limit on the number of amino acid substitutions, deletions, insertions and/or additions that may be made to the encoded PRO830 variants. Thus, the scope of the claim includes numerous structural variants, and the genus is highly variant because a significant number of structural differences between genus members is permitted. The specification and claim do not provide any guidance as to what changes should be made. Structural features that could distinguish compounds in the genus from others in the nucleic acid class are missing from the disclosure. No common structural attributes identify the members of the genus. The general knowledge and level of skill in the art do not supplement the omitted description because specific, not general, guidance is what is needed. Since the disclosure fails to describe the common attributes or characteristics that identify members of the genus, and because the genus is highly variant, SEQ ID NO: 174 encoding SEQ ID NO: 175 is insufficient to describe the genus. The written description

requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant identifying characteristics, i.e. structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between structure and function structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. In the instant case, the specification fails to provide sufficient descriptive information, such as definitive structural or functional features of the genus of polynucleotides. There is no description of the conserved regions which are critical to the structure and function of the genus claimed. There is no description of the sites at which variability may be tolerated and there is no information regarding the relation of structure to function. Furthermore, the prior art does not provide compensatory structural or correlative teachings sufficient to enable one of skill to isolate and identify the polynucleotides and polypeptides encompassed. Thus, no identifying characteristics or properties of the instant polypeptides are provided such that one of skill would be able to predictably identify the encompassed molecules as being identical to those instantly claimed. One of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe the genus. Thus, applicant was not in possession of the claimed genus.

Claim 137 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a host cell in culture comprising a polynucleotide with the sequence as set forth in SEQ ID NO: 174, does not reasonably provide enablement for *in vivo* transfection.

The specification discloses that the nucleic acids of the current invention can be expressed in a wide variety of host cell types, including cells within a host animal. However, there are no actual or prophetic examples that disclose how to make or use host cells that comprise a DNA sequence as set forth in SEQ ID NO: 174 in an animal. The Examiner cites Eck & Wilson (page 81, column 2, second paragraph to page 82, column 1, second paragraph) who report that numerous factors complicate *in vivo* gene expression which have not been shown to be overcome by routine experimentation. These include, the fate of the DNA vector itself (volume distribution, rate of clearance into the tissues, etc.), the *in vivo* consequences of altered gene expression and protein function, the fraction of vector taken up by the target cell population, the trafficking of the genetic material within cellular organelles, the rate of degradation of the DNA, the level of mRNA produced, the stability of the mRNA produced, the amount and stability of the protein produced, and the protein's compartmentalization within the cell, or its secretory fate, once produced. Since the instant disclosure does not address any of the methods necessary to make a host cell in an animal which comprises the polynucleotide of interest, the claims as written are not enabled. This rejection could be overcome by addition of the limitation wherein the host cells are isolated.

***35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103***

The following rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are made under the assumption that the effective filing date for the instantly claimed invention is 11/16/2001, which is the actual filing date of the instant application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 119-122, 132-138 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Sehra (2001).

Sehra teaches the cloning of a nucleic acid clone AL160270. The nucleic acid of clone AL160270 is 96.3% identical to the nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO: 174 (see Sequence Comparison A, attached), thus claims 119-122 are anticipated. The nucleic acid of clone AL160270 would hybridize the SEQ ID NO: 174 under stringent conditions, thus claims 132-133 are anticipated. The nucleic acid of clone AL160270 was cloned into a vector and transfected into host cells, thus claims 134-138 are anticipated.

***Conclusion***

Claims 119-123, 132-138 are rejected.

Claims 124-131 are allowable.

***Advisory Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Murphy whose telephone number is (571) 272-0877. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 7:30 am to 5:00 pm. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on (571) 272-0871.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Joseph F. Murphy, Ph. D.  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1646  
April 5, 2004